UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,132	12/18/2000	Jerry Crawford	NC13989	4832

26343 7590 12/29/2003			EXAMINER	
STEVEN A. SHAW			CHUONG, TRUC T	
NOKIA, INC.				
6000 CONNECTION DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MD 1-4-755			2174	
IRVING, TX 75039				

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 October 2003</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-40 and 42-49* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-40 and 42-49* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)	☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .	
2)	☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3)	☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .		6) ☐ Other: .	

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 10/06/03.

2.   Claims 1-40 and 42-49 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 13, 14, 29 and 39

are independent claims. In Amendment A, claims 6 and 11 are amended. This action is made

final.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   Claims 1-6, 10-11, 13-20, 24-34, 38-45, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383).

As to claim 1, Henson teaches a component Customization and Personalization System

(CCPS) comprising:

a central site comprising an interface to a communications network, said

central site further comprising a set of predetermined designs and images and a

graphics server providing graphics tools for enabling a modification of said

predetermined designs and images, and for further enabling the creation of new

designs and images (on-line store, col. 4 lines 36-52);

a user station (customers, col. 4 lines 35-67) coupled to said central site through said

communications network, said user station comprising:

(a) a user interface for enabling a user to access said graphics server for defining a

desired design to be placed on a consumer product (col. 4 lines 41-52, and figs. 3A-C);

and

(b) a manufacturing subsystem for receiving data descriptive of said desired

design, and for manufacturing, at said user station, at least one component of said

consumer product to have said desired design (col. 6 lines 18-21, col. 9 lines 15-21, 40-

55, figs. 5-6, and a person with ordinary skill in the art clearly understands the feature of

using a Web Browser of Windows Operating System which is not only saved any desired

design at a remote site but also automatically saved at local computer as cookie).

As to claim 2, Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said central site further

comprises an electronic commerce engine for conducting a financial transaction with the user in

order to make an accounting for the manufactured at least one component (checkout, cols. 32-52,

and figs. 9-10).

As to claim 3, Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said central site further

comprises means for enabling the user to include the desired design into said set of

predetermined designs and images (shopping cart, col. 9 lines 40-55).

As to claim 4, Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said user interface enables

the user to access said graphics server for the purpose of selecting one of said predetermined

designs as a desired design (standard view, col. 9 lines 15-25).

As to claim 5, Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said user interface enables

the user to access said graphics server for the purpose of creating said desired design by

modifying at least one of said predetermined designs and images (system configuration options, col. 6 lines 17-30 and figs. 3A-C).

As to claim 6, Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said user interface enables the user to access said graphics server for the purpose of creating said desired design by inputting the new design or a new image (save the cart, col. 9 lines 49-55 and fig. 6).

As to claim 10, Henson teaches the CCPS of claim 1, wherein said at least one user station comprises a point-of-sale (POS) terminal (point-of-sale, col. 7 lines 22-38).

As to claim 11, this is a combination of claims 1 and 2. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 2 above.

As to claim 13, Henson teaches a component Customization and Personalization System (CCPS), comprising:

a central site comprising an interface to the Internet (Internet Web site, col. 4 lines 35-42), said central site

further comprising a set of predetermined designs and images and an electronic commerce engine for conducting a financial transaction with the user (see claim 2 above); a user station coupled to said central site through the Internet, said user station comprising:

(a) a user interface for enabling a user to access a graphics program for defining a desired design to decorate at least one component of a mobile station (a personal computer in col. 3 lines 45-55 infers a mobile laptop computer or other mobile devices), the graphics program implementing graphics tools for enabling a modification of said

predetermined designs and images, and for further enabling the creation of new designs

and images (see claim 1 above); and

(b) a manufacturing subsystem for receiving data descriptive of said desired

design, and for manufacturing, at said user station, at least one component of said

consumer product to have said desired design (see claim 1 above).

As to claim 14, Henson teaches a component Customization and Personalization System

(CCPS) user station comprising:

a user interface for enabling a user to access a graphics subsystem (customer configured

machines, col. 4 lines 53-56) for

defining a desired design to be placed on a consumer product (standard view, col. 9 lines

16-21); and

a manufacturing subsystem for receiving data descriptive of said desired design (col. 9

lines 8-24 and fig. 5), and for manufacturing, at said user station, at least one component of said

consumer product to have said desired design (col. 9 lines 25-32 and fig. 5).

As to claim 15, it is individually similar in scope to claim 2 above; therefore, rejected

under similar rationale.

As to claim 16, Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 14, wherein said graphics

subsystem comprises a set of predetermined designs and images (see claim 6 above), and a

graphics tool for enabling a modification of said predetermined designs and images and for

further enabling the creation of new designs and images (database, col. 3 lines 8-12).

As to claim 17, it is individually similar in scope to claim 3 above; therefore, rejected

under similar rationale.

As to claim 18, Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 16, wherein said user interface enables the user to access said graphics subsystem for the purpose of selecting one of said predetermined designs as a desired design (default display, col. 9 lines 9-24 and fig. 5).

As to claim 19, it is individually similar in scope to claim 5 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 20, it is individually similar in scope to claim 6 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 24, it is individually similar in scope to claim 10 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 25, Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 14, wherein said consumer product is a mobile station (a personal computer in col. 3 lines 45-55 infers a mobile laptop computer or other mobile devices).

As to claim 26, Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 25, wherein said at least one component is a cover component of said mobile station (Monitor Choose 92 of fig. 5).

As to claim 27, Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 25, wherein said user interface further enables a user to at least one of select, modify or create an audible signal for use with said mobile station (Sound Card and Speakers of fig. 5).

As to claim 28, Henson teaches the CCPS user station of claim 25, wherein said user interface further enables a user to at least one of select, modify or create a graphical image for use with said mobile station (chassis, col. 15 lines 31-41).

As to claims 29-34, and 38, they are method claims of system claims 1-6, and 10. Note the rejections of claims 1-6, and 10 above respectively.

As to claims 39-40, they are method claims of system claims 14-15. Note the rejections of claims 14-15 above respectively.

As to claims 41-42, they are method claims of the system claim 17. Note the rejection of claim 17 above.

As to claims 43-45, and 49, they are method claims of system claims 18-20, and 24. Note the rejections of claims 18-20, and 24 above respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   Claims 7-9, 21-23, 35-37, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383) in view of Squilla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,719 B1).

As to claim 7, Henson teaches the user inputs a new design or image, but Henson does not clearly show the inputs by digitally scanning an artwork or a photograph. Squilla clearly teaches a film scanner to scan images (col. 4 lines 35-41). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have the Squilla's film scanner in Henson's configured machine to produce a high revolution digital file (col. 4 lines 40-41).

As to claim 8, Henson teaches the user inputs the new design or image, but Henson does not clearly show the inputs by a digital camera. Squilla clearly teaches a digital camera (col. 4 lines 42-46). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to use Squilla's digital camera in Henson's configured machine to

reduce time in digital process of generating images in comparison to regular chemical processes (col. 4 lines 37-46).

As to claim 9, Henson teaches the user inputs the new design or image, but Henson does not clearly show the inputs by a memory card. Squilla clearly teaches a memory card for storing images (col. 4 lines 43-46). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to use highly flexible and compatible of Squilla's memory card in Henson's configured machine to speed up embedding process.

As to claims 21-23, they are similar in scope to claims 7-9 above; therefore, they can be rejected under similar rationales.

As to claims 35-37, they are method claims of system claims 7-9. Note the rejections of claims 7-9 above respectively.

As to claims 46-48, they are method claims of system claims 21-23. Note the rejections of claims 21-23 above respectively.

6.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383) in view of Chien et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0054003 A1).

As to claim 12, Henson teaches the electronic commerce engine accepts a payment from credit card (fig. 10); however, Hensen does not clearly show a payment from the user in a form selected from the group consisting of a credit card, a debit card, a gift card, and a redemption of loyalty points. Chien clearly teaches a payment from the group consisting of credit card, a debit card, a gift card, and a redemption of loyalty points (page 1 [0008], page 4 [0030], and page 6 [0049]). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill

in the art would want to have a highly flexible payment features of Chien in Henson's configured machine to give customers more convenient when shopping online.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/06/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

a.   Henson's system is remotely located not manufactured <u>at the user station</u>.

b.   Henson does not refer to actual building (manufacturing) of the computer machine.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), a person with ordinary skill in the art clearly understands the feature of using a Web Browser of Windows Operating System which does not only save any desired design at a remote site (server) but also automatically saves <u>at local computer</u> as <u>cookies</u>.

Per (b), a component of consumer product at the user station, a user has to provide a manufacture description design of the consumer product for a remote site to build the computer machine according to the user description or design. It is clearly that the user station is a manufacturing subsystem because the modified product can be printed out or saved at the local computer for other different purposes such as: labels, barcodes, stickers, etc.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Truc T. Chuong

12/18/03